

Memo

To: SCC Board
From: Sam Schuchat, EO
CC: Oversight Members
Date: May 18, 2005
Re: Strategic Plan: 2nd Report

This is the second annual report on the progress we have made toward fulfilling the goals and objectives in the Conservancy's strategic plan. Attached to this memo on three 8 ½" x 17" pages is the actual report in three tables. This is the same format we used in the first report. As I mentioned at the last meeting, staff expects to propose some revisions to the strategic plan next year. These will take into account our increased ocean responsibility, educational programs and projects, and may include, subject to legislative action this year, the Bay/Delta and/or a new resource bond.

Summary of the data

Two years into our five-year plan, we are at or ahead almost all of our goals. The bar graph attached illustrates this by showing how far we have come with each goal relative to the 40% mark. Of course, given the nature of our business we have never expected steady, 20% per annum progress, and this is clearly reflected in the data as well. In some cases we have wildly exceeded our most optimistic possible projections, and in a few instances we are still lagging.

In the area of access and trails we are at or ahead all of our goals with the exception of signs for the coastal trail.¹ We have constructed or improved just over 30 miles of coastal trail, 21% of the total goal. We have acquired 31 miles of new right-of-way for the coastal trail and over 47 miles of new right-of-way for regional connecting trails. The latter represents 95% of total goal. We are way ahead of ourselves on accepting offers to dedicate (OTDs) and opening inaccessible places. Our strategic plan called for 38 OTDs accepted, and we have accepted or caused others to accept 50 (132%). Similarly, we have opened 19 formally accessible areas out of a planned 35, or 40%.

¹ At about the time we started designing a logo for the coastal trail, we went through some staffing upheavals. These have settled down, and we expect to have a logo done and a signing program well under way by the time of the Year 3 report.

We are generally way ahead of our goals in the area land acquisition and restoration. The Hearst Ranch transaction, not foreseen at the time we wrote the plan, by itself caused us to greatly exceed 4A, "acquire 67,000 acres of scenic/agricultural/habitat lands" and 7A, "acquire 18,000 acres of agricultural interests." This is ironic; since that time we wrote the plan there was some concern on our staff that we would not be able to meet our goals. We seem to have the opposite sort of problem.

Our progress toward our Bay Program goals is pretty much like our progress coast wide. I am happy to report that we are back on track on the Bay Trail and the Bay Ridge Trail projects. These areas were lagging our first report. We have not acquired as much land as expected (Goal 10A). We believe there are two reasons for this. First, we significantly underestimated the cost and difficulty of acquisition in the Bay Area, particularly upland acquisition. Secondly, we have been focused on our wetland projects. Still, as I point out elsewhere, we have three more years to meet these ambitious objectives.

Concluding Thoughts

In last year's report I commented on the number of things we learned to do differently in the next strategic plan. The only one that is worth repeating here (for those Conservancy board members who were not present a year ago) is the one concerning goals with multiple components. In other words, in the strategic plan we had a goal that read "construct/improve 140 miles of new coastal trail". Is this goal accomplished when we construct, or when we improve? A number of goals had similar issues; for reporting purposes, we have dealt with this by splitting them into two goals with the same number. When we prepare a new strategic plan we will need to grapple with the issue of separating planning activities from implementing activities and achieving the appropriate mix of the two.

May 18, 2005

TO: Coastal Conservancy

FROM: Neal Fishman

SUBJECT: Legislative Report

Attached is a report on pending legislative that may be of interest to the Coastal Conservancy:

Bills Directly Affecting the Conservancy

- AB 848 (Berg). Ocean ecosystem conservation and management

This bill would establish the Ocean Ecosystem Resource Information System in the Department of Fish and Game. This would be modeled after the Klamath Resource Information System (KRIS), the Northern California Ocean Observing System (CeNCOOS), the California Coastal Ocean Currents Monitoring Program (COCMP) and other information systems. The Conservancy is now heavily involved in some of these efforts. The system should serve “as an organized repository of geophysical, relevant atmospheric, oceanographic, and marine biological data...”

While the bill designates the Department of Fish and Game as the repository for this new information system, it also authorizes the Secretary for Resources to designate the Conservancy as the home of the system or to charge the Conservancy with assisting DFG in developing the system. In either case the Conservancy would have to agree to these roles. The bill does not provide funds to establish the system but authorizes the Conservancy to use bond funds, private endowments or other sources of funding.

The bill has moved out of its policy committee and is now in Appropriations Committee.

- AB 1269 (Pavley). Clean Air, Clean Water, Coastal Protection, and Parks Act of 2007

This bill would place a bond act funding various resources programs on an as yet undetermined ballot. The size of the measure is also underdetermined. The measure would fund various clean air and water programs, river protection, coastal protection, and parks and wildlife protection. The Coastal Conservancy and the San Francisco Bay Conservancy Program would be funded by the measure at an undetermined level.

The bill has passed out of its first policy committee and is now in Appropriations Committee.

- AB 1296 (Hancock). San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail

This bill would establish the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail. It would charge the Conservancy, with establishing and leading a group to plan and develop the trail. This group would include the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, Bay Access Inc. (a nonprofit organization), the Association of Bay Area Governments, and other public and private organizations.

The Water Trail is envisioned as a series of facilities for non-motorized boats such as kayaks. These facilities would allow people to have multi-day trips around the San Francisco Bay and Delta. This might include a series of campgrounds, access points, parking areas or other overnight accommodations. The plan for the trail would include an analysis of sensitive sites where boaters should not go, as well as the designation of locations for boating facilities. It might also include the development of interpretive signs or materials.

The bill has passed out of its first policy committee and is on suspense file in the Appropriations Committee. Staff has spoken with the author and sponsors of this bill. They intend to amend the bill to place BCDC in the lead on planning for the trail, while making the Conservancy the eventual lead on development of facilities, consistent with its role on the Bay, Ridge and Coastal Trail systems.

- AB 1524 (Laird). Coastal resources: property dedications: conservation and open-space easements.

This bill would exempt the acceptance by the Conservancy offers to dedicate of open-space easements made pursuant to the Coastal Act. It would also require that the Conservancy accept all such open space easements 90 days prior to their expiration date. The bill was prompted by a report from the Legislative Analyst that noted that the Coastal Commission has over the years required many such offers to dedicate open space easements as well as public access easements. Recent bills made it both easier and an obligation for the Conservancy to accept the access offers, but were silent on the open space offers. This bill would add the open space offers, many of which are nearing their expiration dates.

The bill has passed its first policy committee and is now in Appropriations Committee.

- SB 153 (Chesbro). California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2006

This bill would place a three billion dollar park and resource bond on the 2006 primary election ballot. Funds would be available for a wide range of park and resource programs including: state and local parks, conservancy programs, Wildlife Conservation, ocean protection, forest protection, historical resources, clean water and beaches, and agricultural lands protection. No specific amount is earmarked for the Coastal

Conservancy or the San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program. It is likely these programs would receive several hundred million dollars in total from this measure.

The bill has passed its first policy committee and is now on the Appropriations Committee suspense file.

- SB 200 (Machado). Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy Program

This bill would establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy Program within the Coastal Conservancy. This program would be similar to the San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program, conferring new geographic responsibilities on the Coastal Conservancy, but leaving unchanged the Conservancy's membership and structure. A provision requiring geographic balance in the appointment of legislative oversight members would be the only change in this regard.

The new program would have a full range of programmatic authority in the Delta, but would emphasize the preservation of agricultural operations "in a manner that integrates agricultural activities with environmental protection and that also sustains the economics of the region through wildlife-friendly farming practices, implementation of innovative farming technology, improvement of water quality and water usability, enhancement of habitat, integrated pest management practices, and other approaches..." It would also emphasize protection and restoration of open space, and provision of public access and recreation.

The bill does not require the Conservancy to spend money unless new funds are made available. Any planning costs undertaken with existing funds are to be reimbursed to the Conservancy.

The bill has passed out of its first policy committee and is now on the Appropriation Committee's suspense file.

- SB 658 (Kuehl). Coastal Environment Motor Vehicle Mitigation Program

This bill would establish the Coastal Environment Motor Vehicle Mitigation Program, authorizing the Conservancy to request the Department of Motor Vehicles to collect a yearly vehicle registration fee of up to \$6 from every motor vehicle registered in a coastal or San Francisco Bay Area county that has elected to be part of the program. Thirty percent of the funds would be given to the County of origin. The Conservancy would use the remaining funds when appropriated by the Legislature. The Conservancy and the Counties would use the funds to mitigate the impacts of motor vehicles on natural resources.

If this bill passes and all counties participated in the program, it would generate over \$100 million annually for natural resource programs. The Conservancy and the Counties that participated would be required to make appropriate findings about expenditures of these funds to ensure that they were only used to mitigate impacts attributable to motor

vehicles. The bill is an outgrowth of similar bills introduced over the past several years, sponsored by the Bay Area Open Space Council that would have applied only to the San Francisco Bay Area. The Open Space Council is also sponsoring this bill, as is Cal Coast, an organization concerned with all of coastal California. A similar bill by then Assemblyman Simitian, limited to San Mateo County and air quality, passed the Legislature and was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger.

The bill has passed its first policy committee and is now on the Appropriation Committee suspense file.

Other Bills of Interest to the Conservancy

- SB 695 (Kehoe). Conservation easement registry

This bill would require the Secretary for Resources to establish a conservation easement registry. The registry would list all conservation, open space, and agricultural easements held by the state or purchased with state funds since January 1, 2000. The registry would include a copy of the easement, its purpose, location, size, and holder. The list would be accessible on the internet and updated biannually.

The bill has passed its first policy committee and is now in Appropriations Committee.

- SB 857 Kuehl. Fish passages.

This bill would require the Department of Transportation to assess barriers to fish passage in its stream crossings and to report annually to the Legislature regarding its progress in eliminating these barriers. It would require that new projects not add new barriers and that removal of existing barriers be designed into these projects. The bill also requires that the department report barriers to the CALFISH database.

This bill has moved out of two policy committees and is now in Appropriations Committee.

- SB 956 (Simitian). Coast and Ocean Stewardship Act.

This bill would establish the Coast and Ocean Account Stewardship Tax (COAST) Fund and would impose a one-dollar per night room tax on hotel rooms in coastal and San Francisco Bay counties to be deposited in the fund. The money in the fund would be available for appropriation by the Legislature in set percentages for the Department of Fish and Game, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, Coastal Commission and the California Travel and Tourism Commission. The funds would be used by these organizations to promote tourism or to carry out their existing mandates to protect coastal and ocean resources.

The bill is in its first policy committee.